O6CKBECC UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----x 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 19 CR 704 (LAP) V. 5 BRANDON BECKER, 6 Remote Conference Defendant. 7 -----x 8 New York, N.Y. 9 June 12, 2024 10:00 a.m. 10 Before: 11 12 HON. LORETTA A. PRESKA, 13 District Judge 14 APPEARANCES 15 DAMIAN WILLIAMS United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York VLADISLAV VAINBERG 17 Assistant United States Attorney 18 BOBBI C. STERNHEIM Attorney for Defendant 19 -AND-FASULO GIORDANO & DIMAGGIO LLP 20 BY: MICHAEL EDWARD GIORDANO 21 22 23 24 25

```
(The Court and parties present via video)
1
 2
               THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
               MS. STERNHEIM: Good morning, Judge Preska.
 3
 4
               MR. VAINBERG: Good morning, your Honor.
               MR. GIORDANO: Good morning, your Honor.
 5
 6
               THE COURT: How are you?
 7
               MR. VAINBERG: I'm doing well. Thank you.
8
               THE COURT: Okay, friends. Have you had any
      additional time -- is the court reporter on?
9
10
               (Pause)
11
               THE COURT: Thank you so much.
12
               Have you folks had any additional conversations since
13
      your letters?
14
               MR. GIORDANO: This is Michael -- sorry, Vlad.
15
               MR. VAINBERG: Your Honor, this is AUSA Vlad Vainberg.
               We have not. Particularly since there was one more
16
17
      letter that the defense put in after 5:00 p.m. yesterday, so we
18
     haven't spoken substantively.
19
               THE COURT: Okay.
20
               And, Mr. Giordano, I don't know if you put the letter
21
      in or whatever happened, but it was a lesson for my interns not
22
      to put in a substantive letter with lots and lots of
23
      attachments after 5:00 p.m. We read it, have it onboard, but
24
      it's perhaps not the best practice.
25
               MR. GIORDANO: Yes, your Honor. Understood.
```

1	THE COURT: All right.
2	Let me ask you this: Mr. Becker, you understand,
3	don't you, that you have the right to be present in court with
4	the judge and all the lawyers in New York, right?
5	You're muted, sir.
6	You're still muted.
7	MS. STERNHEIM: We can't hear you.
8	THE COURT: Unmute.
9	THE DEFENDANT: Is that working?
10	Yes, your Honor, I do understand that. Thank you.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	Do I correctly understand that in this instance,
13	today, you've decided to waive that right in order to avoid the
14	aggravation of flying to New York and flying back to
15	California? Is that right?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, that is correct.
17	THE COURT: And you did that after consulting with
18	your lawyers, correct?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.
20	THE COURT: Counsel, is there anything else you want
21	me to ask Mr. Becker on this topic?
22	MR. VAINBERG: Not from the government, your Honor.
23	MR. GIORDANO: Not from the defense, your Honor.
24	THE COURT: Thank you.
25	I find that Mr. Becker has knowingly and voluntarily

waived his right to be present in court today.

May I ask the government why we think that at this point, knowing what we know now, we need to impose home confinement and the like on Mr. Becker? And I do note that, apparently, the supervising pretrial officer in California has recommended that the home confinement be discontinued.

MR. VAINBERG: So, your Honor, obviously, prior to the incident that caused the disqualification of former counsel, in which Mr. Becker set up that interview, he was not on home confinement. That is a new condition, we think correctly added by your court, in response to that bail violation. We understand the argument that it's now been six months or so since that time, and so the government's view is that if your Honor feels that that is sort of an appropriate amount of time to remove that condition, but to continue to impose all other conditions, including electronic monitoring, to permit Mr. Becker to travel for a new job, the government is fine with that.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Giordano, I don't understand fully what the issue is with the electronic monitoring. I don't go to trade shows and conferences, but I'm not so sure I'm familiar with, say, walking through a metal detector or what.

MR. GIORDANO: Yes, your Honor. I think there are two really practical considerations.

The first is that, given the nature of the business, being in the aerospace/defense industries, that these conferences have enhanced security. That's not to say that perhaps there couldn't be arrangements made in advance where Mr. Becker could gain entry to them or they could be made aware of this. We just don't know — every show is different, and every conference is different — whether any particular show, it would be a bar for him to gain entry with the electronic monitor.

Now, obviously, people have knee replacements and different things that make it difficult to go through security, and we have ways of dealing with those. I just can't say, as it stands, that the electronic monitor would be a barrier for him to gain entry and that being a principal role in this job opportunity.

And, second, I think --

THE COURT: I didn't understand the first one.

MR. GIORDANO: So if there are metal detectors --

THE COURT: How do we know that there are?

THE DEFENDANT: Judge -- may I interject, Michael,

Mr. Giordano?

MR. GIORDANO: Briefly, yes.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it's not just trade shows, it's going to Lockheed Martin secured areas as well, and getting padded down and explaining the entire process of my prosecution

when I'm just there to really help them with their imaging of their aircraft and helping them sell products to governments or private companies.

So it's not just trade shows. It's going to offices, corporate offices, secured areas, along with the trade shows, is the primary reason for travel, but I do have to travel places like that as well.

Excuse me. Thank you very much for your time.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Giordano, I think you mentioned in your letter your view that there were other ways that pretrial services could keep tabs on Mr. Becker other than the ankle bracelet. I wasn't quite sure what those were about.

MR. GIORDANO: So my understanding is that previously, the Central District of California — and I'm just grabbing the name of it — had recommended the use of maybe SmartLINK, I believe it's called, and I am just getting the name of it.

It's a method they use that is a phone application that gives realtime location monitoring. I believe that had been rejected by the Southern District, but California is the monitoring district, and if it's a method that they use, and is approved by the court and by pretrial, I don't think the Southern District's position, if it is still their position, that they don't recognize that use of that application as a form of monitoring should be a barrier, because California is the

district that monitors him. And we'd be happy to make

Mr. Becker available or conference with pretrial in the Central

District of California to better understand the practical

implications of it and if it's a viable alternative.

THE COURT: So -- wait.

MS. STERNHEIM: Judge --

THE COURT: Oh, Ms. Sternheim?

MS. STERNHEIM: Hello, Judge.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. STERNHEIM: I just wanted to make a short point on that.

The SmartLINK system, as I understand it, has a much larger range. The Southern District of New York is very small compared to the Central District of California, and, whereas, here, we sometimes run into issues where a defendant's location would exceed the capabilities of electronic monitoring, the SmartLINK system is broader, and I believe that is why it is used in certain districts. It may not yet be used here — maybe it's something that will be used in the future — but it is something that is used more widely in districts that have larger geographical distances.

THE COURT: And, Ms. Sternheim, do you know if it is nationwide?

MS. STERNHEIM: That, I do not know. And certainly any questions the Court has, we will seek answers. And if the

Court feels it appropriate to have the monitoring officer available — it's a little early there now, so we couldn't do it, it's three hours different — we will make that available to the Court, and certainly if there are any questions that you have, we will get answers for you quickly.

THE COURT: And is it your understanding that, as Mr. Giordano said, it works off of one's cell phone?

MS. STERNHEIM: That is correct. With smartphones now, there are all kinds of monitoring capabilities. For instance, some parents use it for their children, some people use it for their older parents. I imagine it works along those lines. The technicalities of it, I can't recite to you, but, as I said, we will get you whatever information you like.

THE COURT: Mr. Vainberg, can you shed any light on any of this?

MR. VAINBERG: Yes, your Honor.

I was going through my emails. One of the last times this came up was in October 2020, when our S.D.N.Y. pretrial services officer, Jonathan Lettieri, emailed Victor Sherman, who was then defendant's counsel, regarding Mr. Sherman's request to use SmartLINK. And in Mr. Lettieri's pretrial services email, he noted that the officer on this in CDCA let me know that Mr. Becker had brought up the possibility of using SmartLINK, a cell phone application, and that you may be filing a petition with the Court regarding this. And then

Mr. Lettieri writes: "I wanted to let you know that our office does not use SmartLINK as a viable form of location monitoring. We are not currently employing or offering it to our court as a possible condition to impose. Considering the issues with the current equipment, we would ask that the defendant install a landline in his home so the equipment could be routed through that instead of a cell tower."

This is from October 2020. I don't have — sitting here today, I wasn't sure that SmartLINK was going to be an issue that would come up, so I don't know if that's still the view of S.D.N.Y. pretrial, but I did want the Court to be aware that it is something that our pretrial office has considered and did not think it was appropriate.

I'd also -- your Honor, I am not aware, in my experience of electronic monitoring, wearing an ankle bracelet posing an impediment to attending conferences or going to trade shows any more, as Mr. Giordano says, having a pacemaker or other metal equipment. It seems to be more of an issue of inconvenience for Mr. Becker to describe why he has an ankle monitor on, rather than an actual impediment to him doing his job. And given that these shows are somewhat hypothetical, it seems like a speculative concern as well.

THE COURT: Mr. Giordano, do you want to address the hypothetical issue?

MR. GIORDANO: I think it's more than a hypothetical,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

your Honor. I think it's a reality that he is going to have to gain entry into offices and conferences that have heightened security measures. His employer, as he represents to me, is well aware of his situation, and if he qualifies for employment there, despite the pending prosecution, not being able to gain entry to these places with the electronic monitor, it is not the fact that he is a defendant facing criminal prosecution, but it is the fact - because his employer is aware of that, as he informed me - but that having this electronic monitoring device is an independent impediment from him gaining entry to these places, and especially in light of the fact that there are reasonable alternatives, that being the SmartLINK app, which is used in the Central District of California, as I understand it. We also propose that he check in. With today's technology, there are a number of ways that he can -- whether it be by a photo or FaceTime or sending his location, there are a number of ways that he can show where he is at any given time, that are perhaps better than wearing the ankle monitor.

And to Ms. Sternheim's point: If he is traveling, if the Court was amenable to having restrictions where he can travel out of state with approval of pretrial or the Court, the ankle monitor would pose — using an alternative method of determining Mr. Becker's actual location is more practical as well, because if the ankle monitor — the technology doesn't allow him to be monitored out of state with the ankle monitor,

then SmartLINK or some other alternative would better determine his location.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Vainberg, do you want to be heard any more as to that? And do you wish to be heard with respect to a curfew?

MR. VAINBERG: With respect to -- just briefly, your Honor, thank you. What's speculative is that there is a conference that Mr. Becker wouldn't be able to gain entry to because he is wearing an electronic monitor. There's simply been nothing presented to the Court that simply wearing an ankle bracelet would somehow prevent him from gaining entry, any more so than he would be prevented from gaining entry because he is currently facing federal felony charges.

And then, obviously, the difference between the smartphone application and an ankle monitor is that the phone application relies on him having the phone with him.

Obviously, it's not unheard of, of folks snipping their ankle bracelets, but it's a bit more difficult to do than just dropping your phone off and doing something else. So it is a more secure manner of monitoring defendants, and one that's used here in this district.

With respect to a curfew: If your Honor is proceeding to lift home confinement, we're happy to be reasonable with respect to a proper curfew, that takes into account any conferences the defendant has to go to, which he would have to

get preapproved through pretrial services and a bail modification order, but a general curfew of 9:00 p.m. would be appropriate.

MS. STERNHEIM: Judge, may I be heard on this briefly?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am.

MS. STERNHEIM: I just would like to say that if electronic monitoring is lifted, as we requested, and the SmartLINK system is put in place, one of the obligations and requirements would be that Mr. Becker has his phone at all times. If he did not, then there would be a basis for the Court to find him in default. But, certainly, there are ways — if he had the monitor, and there was a way he needed to check in at his location with the phone, he could do that, and he would be instructed, as the Court would, that one of his conditions would be that he needs to have his phone with him at all times, which is a very standard thing that all of us basically have at all times. So it isn't anything unusual.

With regard to the curfew: It was my understanding — and both Mr. Giordano and government counsel will correct me if I am wrong — there was a time when he was on a curfew from 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., and we would ask that those restrictions of time be reimposed; the difference being that in the central district, he has to use a car, there are severe traffic issues. If he had a meeting in the evening, he would need sufficient time to get home. I don't think that there is

25

anything unreasonable about it being till 11:00 o'clock. 1 2 THE COURT: What else, friends? Does anybody else want to be heard on any other terms 3 4 and conditions? 5 MR. GIORDANO: From the defense, no, your Honor. 6 MR. VAINBERG: Nothing further from the government. 7 THE COURT: All right. Based on Mr. Becker's performance and the submissions 8 of counsel, the home confinement condition will be lifted. 9 10 The ankle bracelet will be lifted, but I would ask for 11 counsel to confer with pretrial to figure out the phone issue 12 and any additional way of checking in that might be required. 13 The curfew will be 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., subject to 14 modification to the extent that pretrial allows it for 15 employment. Business travel can be throughout the United States, 16 17 subject to approval in advance by pretrial. Personal travel will remain confined to the Central 18 District of California and the Southern and Eastern Districts 19 20 of New York. 21 The monetary bond will be continued. 22 Have I forgotten anything, friends? 23 MS. STERNHEIM: I would just add, Judge - and this is 24 very, very technical - that, obviously, to get from the Central

District of California to the Southern District, you have to

travel through many other districts, and it just should be implied that for travel purposes, he can go from California to New York, as necessary, for court appearances.

THE COURT: Certainly, but I thought they had airports in the Central District of California. Am I wrong?

MS. STERNHEIM: No, you do, but you are in the air, and if a flight stops, let's say, in Chicago, he would then be in another district.

THE COURT: Certainly. All right, all right.

MS. STERNHEIM: I'm just being technical, Judge.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. VAINBERG: And, your Honor, if I may, I hear that your Honor is lifting the ankle bracelet as a form of location monitoring, but just so it's clear on the order, we'd still ask that the Court order location monitoring through a phone application or other alternative means, other than an ankle bracelet, to make sure that pretrial knows that that's still a condition.

THE COURT: Exactly.

And, again, I will ask you folks to confer with pretrial, send me a draft bail modification order, and the removal of the ankle bracelet becomes effective when the bail modification order is signed.

Is there anything else, friends?

MR. GIORDANO: Nothing further from the defense,

O6CKBECC your Honor. Thank you. 1 2 MR. VAINBERG: Nothing from the government. 3 you, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Becker, do you have any questions of 4 5 what is required of you? 6 THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am. I'm clear. Thank you so 7 much, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Thank you. 9 Andrew, do you need anything from any of us? 10 (Pause) 11 THE COURT: Very good. 12 Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you. 13 (Adjourned) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

25